

**MINUTES OF THE SEMINOLE COUNTY
LPA/P&Z COMMISSION
JULY 23, 2003
6:00 P.M.**

Members present: Ben Tucker, Beth Hattaway, Thomas Mahoney, Dudley Bates, Chris Dorworth, Alan Peltz

Absent: Richard Harris

Also present: Matt West, Planning Manager, Don Fisher, Director of Planning and Development Division, Karen Consalo, Assistant County Attorney, Tony Matthews, Principal Planner, Dick Boyer, Senior Planner, and Candace Lindlaw-Hudson, Sr. Staff Assistant.

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 P.M. A quorum was established. The Chairman reviewed for the audience the manner in which the meeting was to be conducted.

Matt West, Planning Manager, asked that item D, the Joint Planning agreement with the City of Sanford, be pulled from the agenda. This was done without objection.

Also, it was requested that the Deep Lake request be continued until the August 6, 2003 meeting.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to continue the Deep Lake item until the August 6, 2003 meeting.

Commissioner Bates seconded the motion.

The motion passed with unanimous approval (5-0).

A. LAKE JESUP WOODS; Harling Locklin & Assoc./Hugh Harling; 81 acres; Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment from Suburban Estates (SE) to Low Density Residential (LDR); (01F.FLU01); Rezone from A-1 (Agriculture) to PUD (Planned Unit Development); south of Myrtle Steet, north of Cadillac Street, and east of Hester Avenue. (PZ01-09)

Commissioner McLain - District 5
Tony Walter, Principal Planner

Tony Walters introduced Lake Jesup Woods application. He stated that this item was heard in February of 2002, previously requesting to be rezoned from A-1

(Agriculture) to R-1AA (Single Family Residential) zoning and a change in Future Land Use from Suburban Estates to Low Density Residential classification. The application is now changed to A-1 zoning requesting a change to PUD (Planned Unit Development).

On April 9, 2002, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) voted unanimously to transmit the large scale land use amendment from Suburban Estates to Low Density Residential to the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) for review, with the 9 conditions, one being the rezoning of the property to PUD (Planned Unity Development), detailed in the Executive Summary. On June 28, 2002, the Florida Department of Community Affairs issued an Objections, Recommendation, and Comments Report (ORC) regarding this particular land use amendment recommending the proposed amendment not be adopted prior to the applicant addressing the comments detailed in the Executive Summary and the Myrtle Street Special Area Study being completed. To date the wetlands delineation has been made but is still open for public comment period and has not been certified by the St. John's River Water Management District (SJRWMD). The applicant has addressed the Florida DCA ORC report comments but there are several inconsistencies with the PUD Plan that need to be classified. The preliminary master plan does not include minimum lot size and minimum lot width and transitioning to half acre lots on the east boundary. The preliminary mast plan does not demonstrate how the plan implements conservation village concepts and the preservation of sensitive lands to support the requested increase in density.

Mr. Walters stated that the staff recommendation was for this item to be continued to the fall cycle or be denied.

There were no questions from the Board at this time.

Hugh Harling introduced the configuration of the property. There is no flood prone area on the property. There are other such areas nearby, but not on this property. This plan has 117 lots and a larger buffer area. In lieu of larger lots, larger buffering has been provided. There is a community trail system which cuts over to Hester Road. It is not to be a trailhead for the County. Density is 2.2 per acre.

Mr. Harling showed pictures of the dense wetlands on the property. One feature of the property is a 10 foot deep ditch, dug in the 1930's, which runs north to south on the property.

Mr. Harling stated that the community wanted a provision of a circular entrance, with a safe configuration for a school bus stop.

Mr. Harling stated that if he can get an easement by the Autumn Chase subdivision, he will make a pedestrian trail to avoid going onto Myrtle Street. He

will preserve .33 acre of wetlands to make up for the loss of wetlands due to the road. He could move the road. This project will have trails and pedestrian opportunities. It will have a minimum of streets which will be curved, with staggered placement of houses. One side of the house and the adjacent house will have 5 foot setbacks, and then there will be increased setbacks on every other house to save trees.

This plan has reduced density. The ditch which runs north to south on the property is plugged at the Myrtle Street end.

Danny DeCirian of Silk Tree Circle, Autumn Chase said that he would like to commend the developer. As President of the North Lake Jesup Community Group, he requested that this item be continued until the completion of the Myrtle Street Special Area Study Phase 3 be completed in September. He is concerned with the larger Lake Jesup community.

Shepard Burr of 2030 Palm Way is an officer of the North Lake Jesup Community, Inc., with 120 members from a broad range of the community. Their mission is to support the rural character of the North Lake Jesup area. He is opposed to the change from Suburban Estates.

Robert Jasmine of 1153 Myrtle Street thanked Mr. Harling for trying, but he stated that the goal of Phase 3 will have more open spaces for drainage. He stated that Mr. Harling's diagram looked like a regular subdivision. He thinks that it should be more like the conservation area concept. Mr. Jasmine stated that he would like to see this project either denied or continued to the fall cycle, after the Phase 3 study is completed.

Debra Shafer of 1740 Bromley Road, Chuluota, wants to second the ideas of Mr. Jasmine. She stated that this is a fragile area and that the matter should be put off until studies are done.

Alex Dickerson of 4851 Hester Avenue said that everything is not resolved. This is a prime drainage area. Local residents want to try something different here. He is concerned with a possible engineering crisis in the future with the drainage in the area.

Mr. Harling stated that the owner has spent \$85,000.00 in studying the drainage in the area. There will be opportunities to change. He requested to move this item forward to the BCC.

Commissioner Mahoney asked about the lot size.

Mr. Walter stated that the smallest size was 50 feet by 125 feet.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that this plan is getting closer to one that he can support. He stated that the Board has just gotten this and that the commissioners do not know enough yet. Staff has not yet completed analysis.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to continue this application to the Fall Cycle.

Commissioner Peltz seconded the motion.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that he is concerned with the closeness of the road to Autumn Chase. There needs to be adequate buffering. He would like to see reduced density, and also more open spaces.

The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

Technical Review Items

Item D was removed from the agenda at the opening of the meeting.

- B. Magnolia Pointe Preliminary Subdivision Plan; Mag Development Co;** Approximately 7.75 acres; Preliminary Subdivision approval for 20 lots; Single Family Residence, zoned R-1AA; 786 Lake Hayes Road. (03-05500013)

Commissioner Maloy – District 1
Denny Gibbs, Planner

Denny Gibbs presented the preliminary subdivision plan for the Magnolia Pointe Subdivision. She stated that drainage issues in the area would be addressed at the time of final site plan approval.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend approval.

Commissioner Bates seconded the motion.

The motion passed by unanimous consent (6 –0).

- C. AK Business Center Expansion Trail Crossing;** Cross Seminole Trail Corridor crossing for AK Business Center Expansion on property located on the northwest side of SR 426 (Aloma Avenue), abutting the Central Florida GreeneWay, containing approximately 14 acres.

Commissioner Maloy - District 1
Tony Matthews, Principal Planner

Mr. Matthews introduced the item stating that the applicant is requesting approval of two trail crossings over the Cross Seminole Trail for the AK Business Center

Expansion. The proposed 63 foot and 15 foot easements will allow for vehicles and utilities to pass between the existing and new portions of the business center. The property is located on the northwest side of SR 426 (Aloma Avenue) and abutts the Central Florida GreeneWay.

Mr. Matthews stated that staff recommendation was for the recommendation to execute the attached letter finding the proposed 63 foot and 15 foot easements consistent with the Seminole County Comprehensive Plan, with staff findings:

1. The existing 20 foot easement is not sufficient to accommodate vehicular access and utility installation for the proposed business expansion.
2. The proposed 63 foot easement will provide vehicular access and utility installation to the proposed expansion.
3. The proposed 15 foot easement is needed to provide a looped water system as required by the Seminole County Utilities Department.
4. Any existing easements must be vacated prior to granting of any new easements.

Commissioner Mahoney asked why the 63 foot width was necessary.

Mr. Matthews stated that it was for utility and vehicular access.

Commissioner Tucker observed that this business center had come before the Board previously, and that the 20 foot access had been noted as being undersized at that time.

Mr. Matthews said that he had not been present and did not know of previous comments on that issue.

Commissioner Tucker then inquired about Camp Road and to the north, about 100 yards north of this facility.

David Martin, from the Engineering Office, spoke next. He stated that the property in question was owned by the Florida Department of Transportation for a maintenance facility, and that it lies on either side of the trail corridor.

Commissioner Mahoney questioned the location of the existing development on the map.

Mr. Matthews indicated using the diagrams where the access was located.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend the chairman execute the attached letter finding the proposed 62 foot easement and 20 foot

easement consistent with the Seminole County Comprehensive Plan, with staff findings.

Commissioner Bates seconded the motion.

The motion passed by unanimous consent (6 – 0).

Item D had been removed from the agenda at the opening of the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

E. Capital Improvements Element: Seminole County, Applicant: Annual Update Of The County's Five Year Capital Facilities Program. (03F.TXT01)

County Wide
Dick Boyer, Senior Planner

Mr. Boyer stated that the Exhibits section of the Capital Improvements Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Plan) is updated annually to incorporate those projects of the County's five year Capital Improvements Program which enable implementation of Plan goals, objectives and policies. The update also evaluates each capital facility's capacity to provide the adopted level of service to existing and projected users within the five-year planning period.

The amendment presented to the Land Planning Agency/Planning and Zoning Commission (LPS/P&Z) and at the first hearing to the Board of County Commissioners reflects the proposed budget items for the next fiscal year (FY 2003/04). Once the new fiscal year's budget has been adopted in September, the list of capital projects will be revised to reflect the adopted budget and include previously approved projects. The updated amendment proposal will be presented for adoption in November or December of this year.

Mr. Boyer reviewed amendments covered in his handout and transportation notes. He stated that staff recommends the proposed Capital Improvements Element amendment to the Exhibits section.

There were no questions at this time.

The public hearing was now closed.

There were no questions from the Board.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend adoption of the CIE as amended with the handout tonight.

Commissioner Bates seconded the motion.

The motion passed by unanimous consent (6-0).

F. Conservation Village, Seminole County, Applicant: Update of Issue FLU 7, Special Area Plans and Evaluation and Appraisal Report Amendments and add Policy FLU 9.3 Special Area Plans to include Myrtle Street Study Area Conservation Village Development Concept.

County Wide
Tony Walter, Principal Planner

Mr. Walter introduced the item by stating that at the March 11, 2003 Board of County Commissioners meeting staff was instructed to pursue implementation of the Conservation Village Design Concept for the Myrtle Street Special Study Area. Staff was also directed to proceed with Phase III of the Study to coincide with the upcoming schedule for Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan amendments. The Phase III Myrtle Street Study is currently underway.

The purpose of the Phase III Study is to identify and prepare needed amendments to Seminole County's Vision 2020 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to incorporate policies supportive of the "conservation village" development and design concepts identified in Phase II. Phase III will also involve preparation of new or amended ordinance provisions in the Seminole County Land Development Code and the evaluation of possible incentive approaches to facilitate implementation of the concept.

Mr. Walter stated that the Phase III activities will be conducted to coincide with the County's upcoming schedule for consideration of Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan amendments in the Fall 2003 amendment cycle and conclude with adoption in December, 2003. The results of Phase III will be presented to the LPA/P&Z later this summer.

Mr. Walter said that to begin the plan amendment process, staff has prepared a proposed draft text amendment to update Issue FLU 7, Special Area Plans and Evaluation and Appraisal Report Amendments and a new Policy FLU 9.3, Myrtle Street Study Area Conservation Village Development Concept to add to Objective FLU 9, Specific Area Plans for LPA/P&Z consideration and recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Mahoney asked the purpose of FLU 7. What are we trying to accomplish by adding that to the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Walter stated that it is to address efficiency in development.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that he saw no purpose in creating a history of what we had done previously in the Comprehensive Plan.

No one had questions from the public.

The public hearing portion of the meeting was now closed.

Commissioner Mahoney asked about density in the conservation village concept.

Mr. Walter stated that density is not addressed in the concept. It may be added later on.

Robert King stated that this concept should be promoted.

Robert Jasmine stated that Commissioner McLain asked him in October of 2001 to form a steering committee. The committee wants to remain suburban estates at one unit per acre. There is a need to work out who will be paying for things like the \$22.5 million price tag for storm water improvement in this area in phase 3. Mr. Jasmine stated that the committee thinks the concept can work at one unit per acre. There may not be enough land to work this out, however. He hopes that this can be passed on.

Debra Shafer of 1740 Bromley Road stated that this concept can be used in several areas of the county. We must address density. She asked to have this passed forward.

Hugh Harling stated that there is definitely a market for smaller lots. It is good to provide variety in lot size. Sameness does not provide value. Density influences ability to deliver services to an area. The Conservation Village will save wild life and provide for drainage. The Code and Public Works are the biggest challenge to developers today. Standards have shifted. Smaller road systems should be able to be designed. Exceptions to current requirements would help.

Don Fisher stated that Mr. Walter will be presenting this concept to the Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Tucker asked if the concept would be applied throughout the county with slight modifications.

Mr. Fisher stated that this concept will help to point out areas to be preserved on a property under development and for preservation of open space.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that the Board of County Commissioners had already directed the execution of Phase 3. He wanted to add that density should be addressed early. Density is necessary to have services delivered.

Don Fisher stated that financial feasibility is part of the Phase 3 consideration.

Commissioner Hattaway asked about exceptions being provided in this element.

Mr. Fisher stated that exceptions will be recommended as part of the Conservation Village Element.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend to the BCC that they adopt Policy FLU 9.3.

Commissioner Peltz seconded the motion.

The motion passed by unanimous consent (6 – 0).

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend to the BCC that they not adopt FLU 7.

Commissioner Dorworth seconded the motion.

Commissioner Bates pointed out that the difference was only the addition of a few words.

Commissioner Mahoney withdrew his motion.

Commissioner Peltz made a motion to recommend approval of FLU 7.

Commissioner Bates seconded the motion.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that he objected and would be voting “no.”

The motion passed by a vote of 5 – 1.

G. Vihlen Road Rezone; Robert Dollard, applicant; 4.02 acres; Rezone from A-1 and R-1A to all R-1A; located on the east side of Vihlen Road, ½ mile north of CR-46A (Z2003-021)

Commissioner McLain – District 5
Jeff Hopper, Senior Planner

Mr. Hopper stated that the applicant, Robert Dollard, requests approval of R-1A zoning on a 4.02-acre site on Vihlen Road north of CR 46-A. Located in the Low Density Residential future land use designation, the property is programmed under the Vision 2020 Plan for a maximum of 4 units per net buildable acre. However, as a request for conventional zoning (i.e., not PUD), the application is subject to the lot compatibility analysis required under Ordinance 98-53. This analysis supports a zoning classification of R-1AA. Mr. Hopper stated that staff

recommendation was for approval of the requested R-1A classification per the staff report.

Robert Dollard stated that there are three homes on the property now. The small home on the front will be demolished. The houses on the northwest and southeast corner will be repaired. A small neighborhood of houses will be better than what is there now. The oak trees will be preserved on the site as much as possible. He wants to have lots sold individually, with different builders.

Sid Vihlen of 520 Vihlen Road stated that he was in opposition. He is not opposed to development here. However, R-1A is not compatible to the area. The area was developed years ago with ½ to 5 acre lots. The average lot is 1.62 acres. There are 2,700 square foot houses in the area. There are no more areas to be developed nearby. The R-1A Ravena Park subdivision is isolated from Vihlen Road. Lots have been built out and buffered for many years. The development to the north is Kays Landing. This is being planned. The entrance will be at the other end of Vihlen Road. He suggests that R-1AAA is better here. He requests that this be denied.

Terry Salzberg of 378 S. Country Club Road spoke on behalf of his parents who own adjacent property off of Tall Tree Lane. They are concerned about the easement road to the south.

Sharon Carter of 3214 Tall Tree Lane said that she lives across from the site and is not opposed to development. She is concerned with the drainage problem in the area. This property in question is 1.5 feet lower than her property. The properties would have to be hooked up to central water and sewer. R-1A is too intense. R-1AAA is more compatible. She would like to see a natural vegetative buffer rather than the wall.

In rebuttal, Mr. Dollard said that Tall Tree Lane cannot be used for access. No trees will be touched in the buffers. The front on Vihlen Road is all that would be seen. The County has stated that they must have sewers and water.

Commissioner Tucker questioned the paving of the road.

Mr. Vihlen said that the staking in the area was done by Kays Landing.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that keeping trees on a property under development is a very difficult thing. Each lot must be designed to drain in a certain way. Trees are taken off because of drainage. He also believes that R-1A is too intense for the area. Vihlen Road is not an R-1A neighborhood. He cannot recommend R-1A.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend denial of R-1A zoning. We could support R-1AA zoning.

Commissioner Hattaway seconded the motion.

Commissioner Tucker reviewed the criteria for R-1A. His concern is for the house size.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that the old houses on the site will probably have to go. R-1AAA will probably be achieved here in house size. No one builds 1,300 square foot houses in an area like this.

Matt West noted that the eastern 170 feet of the site has R-1A zoning.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that the intent of his motion is that the entire site should be R-1AA zoning.

The motion passed by unanimous consent.

H. Florida Conference Association of Seventh-Day Adventists; Glatting, Jackson, et al / John H. Percy, applicant; 5.09 acres; Small Scale Land Use Amendment from PUB (Public) to Commercial; located on the northwest corner of West Lake Brantley Road and SR 436. (Z2003-020, 07.03SS.01)

Commissioner Van Der Weide – District 3
Jeff Hopper, Senior Planner

Mr. Hopper stated that the applicant requests a Small Scale Land Use Amendment from Public to Commercial on a 5-acre site adjacent to the Forest Lake Academy property at the intersection of West Lake Brantley Road and SR 436. The existing zoning of C-2 is inconsistent with the future land use designation assigned by the Vision 2020 Plan. State law requires consistency between zoning and the Comprehensive Plan. Staff recommends approval of the request per the staff report.

John Percy stated that he agreed with the staff report and asked for a recommendation of approval.

There were no questions or comments on the item.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend approval as per the conditions of the staff report.

Commissioner Peltz seconded the motion.

The motion passed by unanimous consent (6-0).

I. Tallman Mews; Jay Barfield, applicant; 5.10 acres; rezone from A-1 (Agriculture) to R-1AAA (Single Family Dwelling District). Located 0.4 mile west of Tuskawilla Road, on the north side of Gabriella Lane. (Z2003-022).

Commissioner Maloy – District 1
Jeff Hopper, Senior Planner

Mr. Hopper stated that the applicant, Jay Barfield, requests approval of R-1AAA zoning on a 5.1-acre site on Gabriella Lane, west of Tuskawilla Road. Located in the Low Density Residential future land use designation, the property is programmed under the Vision 2020 Plan for a maximum of 4 units per net buildable acre. However, as a request for conventional zoning (i.e., not PUD), the application is subject to the lot compatibility analysis required under Ordinance 98-53. This analysis supports the requested zoning classification of R-1AAA. Staff recommends approval of the request for rezoning from A-1 (Agriculture) to R-1AAA (Single Family Dwelling District).

Jay Barfield stated that he is going to develop 8 lots. He will not be affecting traffic in any appreciable way. He plans an upscale neighborhood, not a subdivision. There is a pond on the property of .7 acres. Drainage runs toward the pond. There are over 200 trees on the property. The requested zoning gives flexibility in lot size to save trees. He will swale the lots and preserve the existing trees.

Commissioner Mahoney asked about house size.

Mr. Barfield said that the houses would be 2,500 to 4,000 square feet. The requirements are the same.

Commissioner Mahoney asked if Mr. Barfield would consider agreeing to a minimum house size.

Mr. Barfield said that 2,200 square feet would be a good minimum size.

Ray Saunders spoke on the history of the land. He stated that he had owned the land for 30 years. It had been an orange grove. He had cleared the land when the trees died off and replanted new trees and expanded the pond.

Hugh Harling spoke for Mr. Barfield. He stated that Mr. Barfield intends on saving trees on the site. He urged support for the project.

Karen Weaver of 4212 Gabriella Lane owns adjacent property and stated that there is much wild life on the site. She rides her horse in the area and is concerned with auto traffic and increased density changing the rural character of the area.

Gary Lonston of 4353 Steve Terrace, Kings Cove, spoke next. He wanted to know what the eastern boundary of the property was. He was concerned about the easement. Would this easement be the access to the 8 houses?

Bob Karns of 4361 Steve Terrace was concerned about the value of his home being effected and the preservation of the trees on the property.

Matt Illardi spoke about his major concerns on compatibility. RC-1 estates would be more compatible. The trend is for suburban estates here. There are 17 homes in the area. 14 of the homeowners oppose the proposed density. One acre lots are not objectionable. The Comprehensive Plan talks about protection to the homeowner.

Kings Cove and Autumn Glen are not part of this neighborhood.

Dennis Weaver had concerns for the environment. Fewer homes being built there would be better.

Frank Carbon of 4265 Gabriella Lane is also concerned with the compatibility of this density. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan wants to preserve wild life and endangered species. He is President of the Bear Gully Lake Association. Bear Gully Lake is a fragile 125 acres. This project could cause runoff into the lake. He urged the consideration of one home per acre for density here.

Donna Ryan of 4150 Gabriella Lane has a 5 acre parcel near the site. She opposes the rezoning.

Nick Helia of 4111 Gabriella Lane also opposes the increased density and rezoning.

Mark Jacobsen of 4320 Gabriella Lane said that he supports one acre lots in the area.

Mike Bibowitz of 4399 Gabriella Lane said that he also wanted one acre lots here.

In rebuttal, Mr. Barfield stated that his request is reasonable. There is a 15 foot easement on the east side of the property.

The public hearing was now closed.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that he can generally support a rezoning that is not too far from the local norm. A better solution is R-1AAA with 7 lots – 2 lots per net developable acre.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend approval of R-1AAA zoning with 2,200 square foot houses and 7 lots maximum.

Commissioner Dorworth seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of 5 – 1. Commissioner Peltz voted “no.”

- J. Deep Lake PUD; Ronald Henson II, applicant;** Major Revision to PUD Preliminary Master Plan for the development of mixed residential and commercial uses; approximately 18.66 acres located on the south side of SR 426, and the west side of Deep Lake Road (Z2002-008).

Commissioner Maloy - District 1
Jeffrey Hopper, Senior Planner

This item was continued to the August 6, 2003 meeting at the beginning of the meeting.

(SECTION ONE)

- K. CELERY AVENUE ADMINISTRATIVE LARGE SCALE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT SEMINOLE COUNTY;** Administrative Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment From Suburban Estates (SE) To Low Density Residential (LDR); Located On The North And South Sides Of Celery Avenue From The Sanford City Limits On The West To A Point West Of Cameron Avenue. 02F.ADM01 (Z2002-017)

(SECTION TWO)

Celery Avenue Administrative Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Seminole County; Administrative Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment From Suburban Estates (SE) To Mixed Development (MXD); Located South Of Celery Avenue, Between SR 415 And Approximately 1373 Feet West Of Cameron Avenue 02F.ADM01 (Z2002-017)

Commissioner McLain - District 5
Matthew West, Planning Manager

Mr. West stated that this is an administrative land use amendment. In June 2002, the Board of County Commissioners directed the planning staff to process two administrative land use amendments for the Celery Avenue Corridor Area. The first area, known as Section One, comprising approximately 538 acres, is an administrative land use amendment request from Suburban Estates to Low Density Residential. The remaining 94 acres, known as Section Two, is an administrative land use amendment request from Suburban Estates to Mixed Development.

During the Fall 2001 Large Scale Land Use Amendment Cycle, Planning Staff processed an administrative land use amendment, but the Board of County Commissioners chose not to transmit the request to the Department of Community Affairs for review. Since that time, the City of Sanford has approved two single family residential subdivisions, which will permit up to 600 new homes in the area. Additionally, the City of Sanford has planned over \$45 million in sewer and potable water upgrades and improvements and anticipates installing a new lift station to expand capacity in the Celery Avenue Corridor area.

Mr. West stated that staff recommends the transmittal to the Florida Department of Community Affairs of the administrative land use amendment from Suburban Estates to Low Density Residential for review. However, Planning Staff does not recommend approval of the Low Density Residential land use until a financially feasible plan or funding mechanism is established for roadway improvements to Celery, Beardall, and Brisson Avenues prior to the final adoption of the land use amendment, with findings that the Low Density Residential land use, as proposed would be:

1. Consistent with Vision 2020 Plan policies related to the Low Density Residential land use designation; and
2. Consistent with adjacent Suburban Estates land use; and
3. Appropriate transitional use at this location; and
4. Consistent with the development trends for the development of single family residential subdivisions along the Celery Avenue Corridor within the City of Sanford; and
5. The proposed Low Density Residential land use represents an orderly progression from developed areas in the west to the east; and
6. Consistent with Vision 2020 Plan policies identified at this time.

Staff recommends the transmittal to the Florida Department of Community Affairs of the administrative land use amendment from Suburban Estates to Mixed Development for review. However, Planning Staff does not recommend approval of the Mixed Use Development land use until a financially feasible plan or funding mechanism is established for roadway improvements to Celery, Beardall, Brisson, and North Cameron Avenues with findings that the Mixed Use Development, as proposed, would be:

1. Consistent with Vision 2020 Plan policies related to the Mixed Use Development land use designation; and
2. Consistent with adjacent Suburban Estates, Low Density Residential, and Industrial land uses; and
3. Appropriate transitional use at this location; and
4. Consistent with Plan policies identified at this time.

Mr. West concluded by adding that staff recommends that prior to the adoption of the administrative land use amendments, the County, in conjunction with the City of Sanford, adopt a Joint Planning Agreement with the following conditions:

1. A zoning overlay for the Celery Avenue Corridor is created and caps the residential density within Section One at 3 dwelling units per net buildable acres;
2. Require central water and sewer services for developments with an intensity greater than one dwelling unit/net buildable acre;
3. Develop a financially feasible plan or funding source for roadway improvements to Brisson, Beardall, Celery, and North Cameron Avenues.

Mr. West said that the City and the County had a joint planning agreement, which has expired. This agreement will be progressing. The City has agreed to 3 dwelling units per acre in this area. This will cut in half the present density trends in the area. This is why we are recommending transmission of this land use amendment, pending the Joint Planning Agreement being brought forth.

Residents don't want more than one dwelling unit per acre. The BCC does not object to voluntary annexations. There will be an overlay of standards for the Celery Avenue corridor. Russ Gibson of Sanford will be working with us on this.

We will work with the community to see what they want there, holding a series of public meetings for input.

In Area 2, the city wants to cap development at 6 dwelling units per acre. The I.F. A.S. property between Brisson and Sipes Avenues, south of Celery Avenue has a potential for retention. The Club 2 borrow pit is almost done,

CPH Engineering is studying the area and will be making recommendations.

Commissioner Tucker asked about the traffic level of the road now.

Mr. West said it was at level A now according to Traffic Engineering. It is projected that by the year 2020 it will be at level F. There is a good grid system there now.

Commissioner Hattaway asked about the minimum square footage in the two development Mr. West mentioned in his presentation.

Mr. West said that the minimum lot size is 60 feet by 115 feet, with 1,500 square foot minimum house size. The second development has 6,000 square foot lots.

David Tewilleger of 4220 Chickasaw Drive stated that he is concerned about the quality of life in the area. There are many substandard roads in the area. He said that he wanted to see more upscale housing in the area. Area 1 should be

extended past Cameron Avenue past SR 415. He is opposed to increased density in Area 2. He stated that he would like to participate in any future discussions with the public on the area.

Janet Grimshaw of Chickasaw Drive in Indian Mound Village is concerned with the fragile river environment, drainage issues in the area, and historical sensitivity to the area. One unit per acre density here is best.

Becky Meisel was concerned about speeding and traffic in the area. She was also concerned with drainage in the area. She is also concerned with school bus safety.

School Board comments by Dianne Kramer indicated that "This proposed change, in combination with the other residential approvals in this area, could have a major impact on the school system... especially at the elementary school level. The same schools listed under item V A serve this area. Without additional development information, the expected number of additional students cannot be calculated, but the density caps appear to permit over 2,000 units, which could fill an elementary school. It would be appropriate to reserve an elementary school site (15 acres) in this area. "

Ken MacIntosh of Indian Mound Village stated that he has made 10 appearances before the boards to address this consideration. He stated that there are areas of ambiguity between sections of the JPA. The agreement could run out prior to 2013. He recommends denial. This is a private interest driven issue. In the past this board has recommended disapproval. Nothing has changed.

Commissioner Tucker asked about concurrency in the area.

Mr. West stated that concurrency covers roads, not schools. Furthermore, stop signs will not deter speeding in the area roads. Bus stops can be designed into the overlay area. Parkland cannot be required to be donated. The Joint Planning Agreement was pulled by the County Manager due to concerns about language concerning annexation.

Commissioner Hattaway stated that the county is not in the same condition that existed two years ago. The land is going into intense development.

Commissioner Bates said that there was nothing to stop the development. We have regressed. We need some kind of control.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend adoption of the Land Use Amendment to Low Density Residential with the conditions staff enumerated, with a cap of 3 dwelling units per net buildable acre in area one and to 6 dwelling units per net buildable acre in Area 2. Secondly, require central water and sewer, and third, the City of Sanford will assume

maintenance of Celery Avenue through the adoption of a separate agreement.

Commissioner Peltz seconded the motion.

Commissioner Hattaway stated concern about the Joint Planning Agreement running out.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that the most important thing was getting the agreement.

Commissioner Tucker expressed concerns about the needs of the area and stated that he would not support this.

The motion passed by a vote of 5 to 1. Commissioner Tucker voted “no.”

Commissioner Mahoney requested of staff that a discussion of the orange zoning chart with setbacks and minimum house sizes be scheduled for the September meeting.

PLANNING MANAGER’S REPORT

Mr. West reported that Hester Avenue was rezoned to PUD with a maximum of 40 units. Also, on the W. Lake Brantley rezone application, the applicant was required to put up a wall.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:05 by unanimous consent.

